

REMARKS

Claims 1, 11, 18, 24, 34, and 39 have been amended. Claims 1-47 remain pending.

The Examiner has objected to the claims for 1-10 and 39-47 under 37 §CFR 1.75(a) as failing to particular point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. The amendments remove the objectionable language.

The Examiner has specified allowable subject matter on p. 14-15 of the specification which teaches each processor being "coupled to or integrated with one or more memory devices." The independent claims have been amended to specify that each (or at least some of) the processors have access to a memory portion that is sized to hold at least one of the image portions and that different image portions are output to different memory portions accessible by different processors (or distributor mechanisms for performing the same operation). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentable over the cited references.


The claims also contain additional limitations that distinguish them over the cited references. For example, claim 1 recites that "the defect determination operations for the first and second image portions are each based on analysis of substantially all of the respective image portion." That is, the defect determination for an image portion is based on analysis of substantially all of the image portion, *i.e.*, or substantially all of the pixels in the image portion. Claim 11 requires "analyzing substantially all of each image portion for defects within the selected processor based on the selected one or more algorithms for such selected processor to then determine whether the corresponding portion of the each analyzed image portion has a defect." Basing the defect determination on the entire group of pixels allows a more flexible and rich defect process, as opposed to basing defect determination on a single pixel analysis. In contrast, the primary reference Forslund teaches analysis of each pixel and then determining whether the analyzed defect is defective and then repeating such analysis and defect determination process on a subsequent pixel.

Since Forslund and the secondary references fail to teach or suggest patch processing (or mechanisms for facilitating the same) in the manner claimed, it is submitted that claims 1, 11, 18, 24, 34, and 39 are patentable over the cited references.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a

telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


Mary R. Olynick
Reg. 42,963

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100